UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO CASE NO. 1:10-cv-00564-MRB

LEXMARK INTERNATIONAL, INC. Plaintiff

V.

INK TECHNOLOGIES PRINTER SUPPLIES, LLC et al
Defendants

STIPULATED PERMANENT INJUNCTION, CONSENT JUDGMENT, AND DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE

This matter is before the Court on the stipulated motion of Plaintiff, Lexmark International, Inc. ("Lexmark") and John Doe Defendant Imaging Products Inc. d/b/a Laser Image Plus, a California corporation having a place of business at 140 McCormick Avenue, Costa Mesa, CA 92626-3307 ("Laser Image"), for entry of Stipulated Permanent Injunction, Consent Judgment and Dismissal With Prejudice, having agreed to a compromise and settlement of this action.

IT IS HEREBY FOUND, ORDERED, ADJUDGED WITH CONSENT OF THE PARTIES that:

Lexmark is in the business of developing, manufacturing and selling laser 1. printers and toner cartridges—including corresponding versions thereof made by Lexmark under private label for Dell, IBM, Toshiba, Nashuatec, Unisys, and Source including toner cartridges for Lexmark's T420; T520/522; Technologies, T610/612/614/616; T620/622; T630/632/634; T640/642/644; E120: E220; E321/323; E330/332; E340/342; E230/232/234/238/240; E320/322; and E250/350/352/450 laser printers as well as the private-label versions thereof (collectively, "the Toner Cartridges").

- 2. Lexmark owns and has standing to sue for infringement of United States Patent Nos. 5,337,032; 5,634,169; 5,758,231; 5,758,233; 5,768,661; 5,802,432; 5,875,378; 5,995,772; 6,009,291; 6,078,771; 6,397,015; 6,459,876; 6,487,383; 6,496,662; 6,678,489; 6,816,692; 6,871,031; 6,879,792; 7,139,510; 7,233,760; and 7,305,204 (the "Lexmark Patents").
- 3. Laser Image, its parent, divisions, subsidiaries, affiliates, successors and assigns and its directors, officers, and employees, or any of them is in the business, among other things, of importing and/or selling remanufactured Toner Cartridges in which rights in the Lexmark Patent rights were not exhausted, compatible versions of the Toner Cartridges, and/or clones of the Toner Cartridges (collectively, "the Accused Cartridges").
 - 4. The Lexmark Patents are valid and enforceable against Laser Image.
- 5. The following table identifies the patent claims of the Lexmark Patents that are satisfied literally by the Toner Cartridges and the Accused Cartridges:

Toner Cartaloger / Accused Cartaloger Michigan								
Patent E120								
5,337,032			1,5,6					
16110162			1-3,32-34, 36,42	32,36,42	32,36,42			
5,758,231	1-16	1-16		1-16	1-16			
5,758,233			1-4					
5,768,661			1,2,3,6					
5.802.432			1-3, 7-9					
5,875,378			1-3,12-14,24					
5,995,772			1-3,5,7-9, 12,14-18,20,21	14,15,22, 32-34	14,15,22, 32-34			
6,009,291 1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2					

	Tone: Carninges / Accused Carninges							
Patent	El20	BZSVEGAV BYSV/EGAV		TO VIEW TEN		E220 and		
6,078,771	1,5,6,10, 12,13,15	1,5,6,10, 12,13,15	1,5,6,10, 12,13,15	1,2,5,6,10, 12,13,15				
6,397,015				1-4,7-12, 14-19,22-24	1,2,4, 9,17,19	1,2,4, 9,17,19		
6.459.576				1-28				
6.4137.486	1,2,6, 10,15,19	1,2,6, 10,15,19	1,2,6, 10,15,19	1,2,6,10, 11,15,19	19	19		
6.496.662		1,3,5,7	1,3,5,7			7		
6,678,439		5-6	5-6					
6.816,692	1-13	1-13	1-13	, and a second s		M Residence		
COLUMN TO THE		1-6,8-12	1-6,8-12					
6 2 79 7792		1-11	1-11	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		The state of the s		
7,139,510		1-10	1-10					
7/283F760	11,12,14	11,12,14	11,12,14			, ,		
7,385,204		1-20	1-8,10-13	AND THE RESERVE AND ASSESSMENT OF THE PARTY				

- 6. The importation, use, remanufacture, manufacture, offer to sell or sale by anyone other than Lexmark of any Toner Cartridge that was originally sold outside the United States constitutes an infringement the above-identified claims in the Lexmark Patents.
- 7. The importation, use, remanufacture, manufacture, offer to sell or sale by anyone other than Lexmark of any Toner Cartridge in the United States under which Lexmark's Patent rights were not exhausted constitutes an infringement the above-identified claims in the Lexmark Patents.
- 8. Except for any cartridge in which Lexmark's Patent rights have been exhausted, this Court permanently enjoins Laser Image as well as those persons or companies in active concert or participation with Laser Image who receive actual notice of the order by personal service or otherwise from making, using, selling, offering for

sale or importing into the United States Accused Cartridges that infringe any of the above-identified patent claims or are not colorably different from the Accused Cartridges.

- 9. Nothing herein limits or shall be construed to limit in any way Laser Image's activities with respect to toner cartridges in which Lexmark's patent rights have been exhausted. Further, nothing herein limits or shall be construed to limit in any way Laser Image's activities with respect to any Lexmark Patents that have expired, lapsed, are no longer enforceable, or have found to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction.
- 10. Laser Image represents and warrants that it has disclosed to Lexmark the quantity and type of all Accused Cartridges that it made, used, sold, offered for sale, or imported into the United States.
- 11. Laser Image consents to personal jurisdiction by this Court, consents to venue in this District, and waives services of process for this action.
- 12. Laser Image agrees to pay Lexmark a monthly, settlement amount on the terms to which the parties confidentially agreed. If Laser Image defaults on any of its monthly settlement payments, the remaining principal sum then unpaid shall become immediately due and payable and Lexmark make seek recourse from this Court.
- 13. This Court retains jurisdiction over Lexmark and Laser Image to the extent necessary to enforce the terms of this Stipulated Permanent Injunction, Consent Judgment, and Dismissal With Prejudice and the agreement between the parties.
- 14. This Stipulated Permanent Injunction, Consent Judgment, and Dismissal With Prejudice shall be binding upon and shall inure to the benefit of Lexmark and Laser

Image as well as each of its respective subsidiaries, corporate parents, affiliates, and/or successors and assigns.

15. All claims between Lexmark and Laser Image are hereby dismissed with prejudice, with each party to bear its own costs and attorneys' fees.

Dated: July 31, 2012]\
By: s/ Michael R. Barrett

United States District Court Judge

HAVING BEEN SEEN AND AGREED TO ON JULY 2012

By:

P. Douglas Barr (Ohio Bar No. 20868)

Steven B. Loy Anthony J. Phelps STOLL KEENON OGDEN PLLC 300 West Vine Street, Suite 2100

Lexington, KY 40507 Telephone: (859) 231-3000 Facsimile: (859) 253-1093

William J. Hunter, Jr. STOLL KEENON OGDEN PLLC 2000 PNC Plaza 500 West Jefferson Street Louisville, KY 40202 Telephone: (502) 333-6000 Facsimile: (502) 333-6099

Timothy C. Meece V. Bryan Medlock Matthew P. Becker Jason S. Shull BANNER & WITCOFF LTD. 10 South Wacker Drive, Suite 3000 Chicago, Illinois 60606 Telephone: (312) 463-5000

Attorneys for Plaintiff, Lexmark International, Inc. Rob Pool

Imaging Products Inc. d/b/a Laser Image Plus 140 McCormick Avenue Costa Mesa, CA 92626-3307